arXiv:1703.10190v1 [hep-ph] 29 Mar 2017

Composite Higgs models after Run2

Veronica Sanz and Jack Setford
Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Sussex, Brighton BN1 9QH, UK
(Dated: March 31, 2017)

We assess the status of Composite Higgs models in the light of the latest Run 2 Higgs data. Drawing from the extensive Composite Higgs literature, we collect together predictions for the modified couplings of the Higgs, in particular examining the different predictions for κ_V and κ_F. Despite the variety and increasing complexity of models on the market, we point out that many independent models make identical predictions for these couplings. We then look into further corrections induced by tree-level effects such as mass-mixing and singlet VEVs. We then investigate the compatibility of different models with the data, combining the Run 1 and recent Run 2 LHC data. We obtain a robust limit on the scale f of 500 GeV, with stronger limits for different choices of fermion embeddings. We also discuss how an excess in a Higgs channel could pinpoint the type of CH model responsible for it.

INTRODUCTION

Composite Higgs models offer an elegant solution to the hierarchy problem of Higgs physics. They postulate the existence of a new strongly interacting sector which confines not far above the electroweak scale. This sector is taken to be endowed with a global symmetry which is spontaneously broken in the confining phase, protecting the Higgs mass from corrections above the compositeness scale. Although the idea is reasonably straightforward, there are, as with most theories Beyond the Standard Model, many possibilities for its realisation.

Although this plethora of models offers a variety of unique and interesting predictions, those that are most immediately testable are the modifications of the Higgs couplings to the rest of the Standard Model fields. Of particular interest are the values of the coupling modifiers κ_V and κ_F, as defined in [1].

In this paper we summarise the predictions for these couplings in Composite Higgs (CH) models. We make the case that, despite the diversity of models in the literature, these predictions have very generic structures, and we attempt to provide some intuition for this fact.

We then investigate some simple cases in which tree-level effects can modify these generic structures. These can occur, for instance, in models with extra singlets that get vacuum expectation values (VEVs), or models with an extra $SU(2)_L$ doublet that mixes with the Higgs. We point out that to leading order the modifications to κ_V and κ_F are precisely as one would expect in corresponding elementary models, plus the usual CH corrections.

Taking the generic structures we have identified, we then perform a χ^2 fit to the data, allowing for the possibility that different fermions couple in different ways. We place bounds on the compositeness scale f, and identify the classes of models that are most constrained.

THE NON-LINEAR COMPOSITE HIGGS

In Composite Higgs models, the Higgs is realised as a pseudo-Nambu Goldstone boson (pNGB) of a broken global symmetry. This symmetry is a symmetry of a *new* strongly interacting sector, out of which the Higgs emerges as a composite.

Let the global symmetry be denoted $\mathcal{G}$ and the subgroup to which it spontaneously breaks be denoted $\mathcal{H}$. Then the Higgs and the other pNGBs (denoted collectively by ϕ^a, one for each broken generator X^a), are parametrised via

$$U = \exp(i\phi^a X^a/f), \tag{1}$$

where f is an energy scale associated with the spontaneous symmetry breaking. U transforms non-linearly under the global symmetry $\mathcal{G}$:

$$U \to gUh^{-1}, \tag{2}$$

where $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $h \in \mathcal{H}$. By non-linear we mean that the transformation h is field-dependent: $h = h(g, \phi^a)$.

In cases where the coset $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$ is symmetric[1] we are allowed to construct an object (which we will label Σ) whose transformation under $\mathcal{G}$ is *linear*. In all the models considered here [2–19], and in the vast majority of models in the literature, $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$ will be symmetric. This reduces the task of writing down a low-energy effective theory for the pNGBs to a relatively trivial search for invariant combinations of Σ and the other relevant fields.

We will assume that the Higgs boson is a doublet under $SU(2)_L$, which, along with $U(1)_Y$, must be embedded

[1] If T^a and X^a are the unbroken and broken generators respectively, then the Lie algebra of a symmetric coset obeys the schematic relations

$$[T,T] \sim T, \;\; [X,X] \sim T, \;\; [T,X] \sim X.$$

as an unbroken subgroup of $\mathcal{G}$. Although data strongly supports the doublet scenario, non-linear models have been studied in which the four scalar fields are actually a singlet and a triplet under $SU(2)_L$ [20–23].

Gauge couplings

The couplings of the Higgs to the gauge bosons come from the kinetic term for Σ, which in the CCWZ prescription [24] is:

$$\mathcal{L}_{kinetic} = \frac{f^2}{4}\,\mathrm{Tr}[D_\mu \Sigma^\dagger D^\mu \Sigma], \tag{3}$$

where $D_\mu = \partial_\mu - igA_\mu$, with $A_\mu = A_\mu^a T^a$ for each gauged generator T^a. We assume that the Higgs is embedded in a bidoublet $(\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2})$ of a custodial $SO(4) \simeq SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \in \mathcal{H}$ – this is necessary in order to protect the ρ parameter from unwanted corrections [25]. Note that this imposes the non-trivial requirement that $\mathcal{H}$ must contain an unbroken factor of $SO(4)$.

Since we are interested in the couplings of the physical Higgs boson to SM fields, we will expand Σ along the direction in which the Higgs will get a VEV, and set all other pNGB fields to zero. The term in (3) will generically[2] lead to a Higgs-gauge coupling of the form:

$$g^2 f^2 A_\mu A^\mu \sin^2(h/f), \tag{4}$$

which is valid as a series expansion around h/f.

Expanding around the Higgs VEV $h \to \langle h\rangle + h$ (abusing notation slightly) we find the gauge boson masses and couplings:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{gauge} \supset\ & \frac{1}{8}g^2 f^2 \sin^2\left(\frac{\langle h\rangle}{f}\right) W_\mu^a W^{a\mu} \\ & + \frac{1}{8}g^2 f \sin\left(\frac{2\langle h\rangle}{f}\right) W_\mu^a W^{a\mu} h \\ & + \frac{1}{8}g^2 \cos\left(\frac{2\langle h\rangle}{f}\right) W_\mu^a W^{a\mu} h^2. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Identifying[3] $v = f\sin(\langle h\rangle/f)$, we find

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{gauge} \supset\ & \frac{1}{8}g^2 v^2 W_\mu^a W^{a\mu} \\ & + \frac{1}{4}g^2 v\sqrt{1-\xi} W_\mu^a W^{a\mu} h + \frac{1}{8}g^2(1-2\xi) W_\mu^a W^{a\mu} h^2. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} g_{WWh} &= \sqrt{1-\xi}\, g^{SM}_{WWh} \\ g_{WWhh} &= (1-2\xi) g^{SM}_{WWhh}. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

[2] In unusual cases the coupling may be proportional instead to $\sin^2(h/(2f))$, but all this amounts to is a redefinition of ξ and an effective rescaling of f.

[3] Here v is defined as $4M_W^2/g^2$, as in the Standard Model

Since κ_V is defined as g_{WWh}/g^{SM}_{WWh}, we find

$$\kappa_V = \sqrt{1-\xi} \approx 1 - \frac{1}{2}\xi \tag{8}$$

Since the structure of (3) is generic, so too is this result, at leading order, across all Composite Higgs models.

Fermion couplings

In Composite Higgs models the SM fermions usually couple to the strong sector via the *partial compositeness* mechanism [5, 26]. As far as this mechanism pertains to the construction of the low energy effective theory, it involves embedding the SM fermions in representations of the global symmetry $\mathcal{G}$, and then constructing $\mathcal{G}$ invariant operators out of these multiplets and Σ. Such an embedding is sometimes called a spurion – the term spurion refers to the 'missing' elements of the multiplet, since after all, the SM particles do not come in full multiplets of the new symmetry $\mathcal{G}$. The incompleteness of these spurious multiplets contributes to the explicit breaking of $\mathcal{G}$ and allows the Higgs to acquire a potential via loops of SM fermions.

The appropriate representation in which to embed the SM particles would, in principle, depend on the UV completion of the model. Some attempts towards UV completions of Composite Higgs models have been made (see, for example [2, 4, 6]), however for the purposes of most model building the choice of representation is a 'free parameter' of the model. There is, however, good cause to restrict the choice of representation into which the $SU(2)_L$ quark doublet is embedded. As shown in [27], embedding q_L into a bidoublet $(\mathbf{2},\mathbf{2})$ of the custodial $SO(4) \simeq SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$ can prevent anomalous contributions to the $Z \to b\bar{b}$ coupling. This restriction forces one to choose representations that contain a bidoublet in their decomposition under the custodial $SO(4)$ subgroup of $\mathcal{G}$.

To treat the EFT in full generality, one should embed q_L, t_R and b_R into different multiplets Ψ_q, Ψ_t and Ψ_b. The kind of representation that the three quarks are embedded into need not be the same. Thus, even for each coset $\mathcal{G}/\mathcal{H}$, there are a bewildering number of possibilities. However, for the vast majority of models the form of κ_F is actually quite restricted. We tabulate a few examples in Fig. 1.

It might seem strange that so many distinct models lead to so few possibilities for κ_F. In fact, when one examines the structure of the allowed terms in the effective Lagrangian, a general pattern emerges: the lowest order coupling of the Higgs to fermions will generally contain either one or two factors of Σ. For example, in the Minimal Composite Higgs Model (MCHM), the coset group is $SO(5)/SO(4)$, and one can define a linearly transforming Σ in the $\mathbf{5}$ of $SO(5)$, which, expanded along the h

κ_F	Models
$\kappa_F^A = \sqrt{1-\xi}$	$SO(5)/SO(4)$ – [8, 9]
	$SO(6)/SO(4) \times SO(2)$ – [12, 13]
	$SU(5)/SU(4)$ – [14]
	$SO(8)/SO(7)$ – [18, 19]
$\kappa_F^B = \frac{1-2\xi}{\sqrt{1-\xi}}$	$SO(5)/SO(4)$ – [9–11, 17]
	$SU(4)/Sp(4)$ – [3]
	$SU(5)/SO(5)$ – [4]
	$SO(6)/SO(4) \times SO(2)$ – [12, 13]

FIG. 1: κ_F in different models.

direction can be expressed as

$$\Sigma(h) = (0, 0, 0, \sin(h/f), \cos(h/f)). \tag{9}$$

With q_L and t_L embedded in the **5**, Yukawa couplings come from the $SO(5)$ invariant effective operator

$$(\overline{\Psi}_q^{\mathbf{5}} \cdot \Sigma)(\Sigma \cdot \Psi_t^{\mathbf{5}}), \tag{10}$$

leading to a term proportional to $\sin(h/f)\cos(h/f)$. Alternatively one could embed q_L into a **10**, the t_R into a **5** – in this case the Yukawa term originates from an operator like

$$\Sigma^T \overline{\Psi}_q^{\mathbf{10}} \Psi_t^{\mathbf{5}}, \tag{11}$$

and the interaction is proportional to $\sin(h/f)$.

In general the structure must be such that the leading term in the trigonometric expansion is h/f. In almost all cases the relevant term will be proportional to either $\sin(h/f)$ or $\sin(h/f)\cos(h/f)$. This argument is certainly not intended to be rigorous – we merely hope to provide some intuition for the fact the non-linear nature of a pNGB Higgs boson leads to repeated structures even across different models and choices of representations[4].

Following the same procedure as in equation (5), we can expand around the Higgs VEV to find the expression for κ_F, defined by yv/m_F. A coupling of the form $\overline{\psi}\psi\sin(h/f)$ leads to

$$\kappa_F = \sqrt{1-\xi} \approx 1 - \frac{1}{2}\xi, \tag{12}$$

while a coupling of the form $\overline{\psi}\psi\sin(h/f)\cos(h/f)$ leads to

$$\kappa_F = \frac{1-2\xi}{\sqrt{1-\xi}} \approx 1 - \frac{3}{2}\xi. \tag{13}$$

As we stated above, the representation into which we embed t_R and b_R might not be the same – in this case it is quite possible (depending on the details of the model) that the top and bottom couplings to the Higgs have different structures. For instance, in the second example above, although the t_R is embedded into a **5**, the b_R might be embedded into a **10**. As a result the top coupling would scale with $1 - \frac{1}{2}\xi$ while the bottom coupling would scale with $1 - \frac{3}{2}\xi$.

There are (as always) some interesting exceptions. For example, in [16], with q_L in a **5** and t_R in a **14**, one can derive $\kappa_F \approx 1 - 3\xi$. In some models (for some examples, see [9, 16]) more than one operator can be constructed which contributes to the same Yukawa coupling. The degree to which each operator contributes will, in such cases, be a free parameter and will lead to more complex expressions for κ_F. Such models are interesting insofar as they are exceptions – however more minimal scenarios will follow the structure we have outlined above.

No mention has been made so far of the leptonic sector. In theory the lepton Yukawas can also be generated via the partial compositeness mechanism (see for instance [10]). This means that κ_τ (for instance) would also receive corrections, and in minimal scenarios would depend on ξ like κ_F^A or κ_F^B, as defined in Fig. 1.

TREE-LEVEL EFFECTS

In this section we will briefly look at two interesting scenarios that can lead to tree-level corrections to κ_V and κ_F. We will describe these corrections as leading to a new effective ξ_{eff} to be compared with the vanilla prediction for ξ.

The first possibility is that in models with an extra singlet pNGB (such as the $SU(4)/Sp(4)$ and $SU(5)/SO(5)$ cosets), the pNGB potential could induce a VEV for the singlet. This can modify κ_F and κ_V in two ways – firstly a VEV for the singlet η will induce singlet-doublet mixing between η and h. Singlet-doublet mixing (in the elementary case) and its effect on Higgs couplings was studied in detail in [29]. The fact that the h mixes with another scalar means that the couplings will be modified by a factor of $\cos\theta$, where θ is the mixing angle between h and η. For small mixing angles:

$$\kappa_V \approx 1 - \frac{1}{2}\theta^2. \tag{14}$$

There could also be effects similar to those studied above, arising from higher-dimensional terms in the non-linear effective theory. As an example we will look at the $SU(4)/Sp(4)$ model. The gauge boson coupling to the Higgs and η (the equivalent of equation (4)) will be (neglecting hypercharge)

$$\frac{h^2}{h^2+\eta^2}\sin^2\left(\frac{\sqrt{h^2+\eta^2}}{f}\right) W_\mu^a W^{a\mu}. \tag{15}$$

[4] See also [28] for a comprehensive review of different Composite Higgs models, and an especially detailed look at the constraints on the $SO(5)/SO(4)$ coset with Run 1 data.

As expected, there is no dimension-4 coupling of η to the $SU(2)_L$ gauge bosons, but there are higher order terms involving η which could modify the hWW coupling if η gets a VEV. However one should also note that the kinetic term in (3) corrects the Higgs kinetic term:

$$\mathcal{L}_{kinetic} = \frac{\sin^2(v_\eta/f)}{v_\eta^2/f^2}(\partial_\mu h)^2 \approx (1 - \frac{1}{3}\xi_\eta)(\partial_\mu h)^2. \quad (16)$$

After canonically normalising the Higgs field and expanding around small values of $\xi_\eta = v_\eta^2/f^2$ we find that the $\mathcal{O}(\xi_\eta)$ correction to κ_V actually cancels. To leading order in ξ, ξ_η and θ we have:

$$\kappa_V \approx 1 - \frac{1}{2}\xi - \frac{1}{2}\theta^2. \quad (17)$$

The correction due to the singlet VEV thus neatly "factorises" into the mass-mixing correction $\mathcal{O}(\theta^2)$ plus the usual compositeness correction $\mathcal{O}(\xi)$. We can thus define a $\xi_{\mathit{eff}} = \xi + \theta^2$, such that $\kappa_V \approx 1 - \xi_{\mathit{eff}}/2$.

One finds a similar result for κ_F. The singlet VEV modifies κ_F from $\approx 1 - \frac{3}{2}\xi$ to

$$\kappa_F \approx 1 - \frac{3}{2}\xi - \frac{1}{2}\theta^2, \quad (18)$$

and in this case our effective $\xi_{\mathit{eff}} = \xi + \frac{1}{3}\theta^2$.

In the regime where m_η and v are both $\gg v$, the mixing will be small and will scale approximately as

$$\theta^2 \sim \frac{v^2 v_\eta^2}{m_\eta^4} = \frac{1}{g_\eta^4}\xi\xi_\eta, \quad (19)$$

where we have related m_η to f via some coupling: $m_\eta = g_\eta f$.

This coset was investigated in a cosmological setting in [30, 31], where the singlet η plays the role of the inflaton. In such a scenario the size of the singlet VEV has important implications for the scale of inflation, and the mass-mixing of the inflaton would be important also for the process of reheating. Moreover, the singlet η and a non-zero value of ξ_η could be a key component of a solution to the matter-antimatter asymmetry in the Universe [32].

If the value of ξ_{eff} were the same for all couplings (i.e. the modifications to κ_V and κ_{F_i} were the same), then the theory would resemble a CH model without any mixing, only with an apparent rescaling of f. However it is interesting to note that in this case the inferred values of ξ_{eff} from the measurements of κ_V and κ_F are different, which would in principle allow us to experimentally distinguish between these two scenarios.

Another possibility is that the spontaneous breaking leads to another pNGB doublet of $SU(2)_L$ (a composite two Higgs doublet model). In principle, explicit breaking effects could lead to a mixing between the two doublets. This possibility is discussed in [12], and in a different context in [15], in which the two doublets appear from two different spontaneous breakings at different scales.

In this case we will obtain similar results to our expressions above for ξ_{eff}, with a correction from the mass-mixing at $\mathcal{O}(\theta^2)$ that will be present in the elementary case, and the usual correction at $\mathcal{O}(\xi)$ coming from higher dimensional operators (see [33] for a review of the elementary two Higgs doublet model, and [29] for an analysis of the Higgs EFT in such a scenario).

Since we have looked at tree-level corrections to κ_V and κ_F coming from new states in the composite sector, one should also talk about loop level modifications. In principle loops of scalar, fermionic and vector resonances of the strong sector can modify the Higgs couplings. These will arise from higher dimensional ($d \geq 6$) operators in the effective theory, suppressed by factors of f^{4-d}.

STATUS AFTER RUN 2

In this section we study the impact of Run1 LHC data on Composite Higgs models, as well as the improvement which results on adding the 13 TeV results recently released by the collaborations. In Table I we summarize the channels considered in the combination of Run1 and 2 data from ATLAS and CMS, as well as indicate the coupling modifiers that one would obtain in Composite Higgs models, as discussed previously.

Channel	Refs.	κ-factors
ttH, ggH $(H \to \gamma\gamma)$	[34]	$\frac{\kappa_{t,g}^2 \kappa_\gamma^2}{\kappa_H^2}$
$H \to ZZ^*$	[35]	proj. κ_V
VBF, WH $(H \to WW^*)$	[36]	$\frac{\kappa_W^4}{\kappa_H^2}$
HV $(H \to b\bar{b})$	[37]	$\frac{\kappa_W^2 \kappa_b^2}{\kappa_H^2}$
ttH, ggH $(H \to ZZ^*)$	[38]	$\frac{\kappa_{F,g}^2 \kappa_V^2}{\kappa_H^2}$
ttH $(H \to \tau^+\tau^-)$	[39]	$\frac{\kappa_t^2 \kappa_\tau^2}{\kappa_H^2}$

TABLE I: List of 13 TeV channels considered in the fit, with the corresponding κ modifyiers. Note that the 7+8 TeV Run1 data was included using the results of the combination of ATLAS and CMS data in Ref. [1].

The couplings of the Composite Higgs to gluons and photons, κ_g and κ_γ, are functions of the modifications of the couplings to fermions and gauge bosons, which appear at one-loop order, i.e. $\kappa_g^2 = 1.06\kappa_t^2 + 0.01\kappa_b^2 - 0.07\kappa_b\kappa_t$ and $\kappa_\gamma^2 = 1.59\kappa_V^2 + 0.07\kappa_t^2 - 0.66\kappa_V\kappa_t$. The modification of the Higgs width, κ_H is also a function of the coupling modifiers, $\kappa_H^2 \approx 0.57\kappa_b^2 + 0.25\kappa_V^2 + 0.09\kappa_g^2$, see e.g. Ref. [1].

We then perform a χ^2 fit to the ATLAS and CMS data, with the restriction $\xi > 0$. Note that in Ref. [35], the channel $H \to ZZ^* \to 4$ leptons was searched for,



FIG. 2: $\chi(f)^2 - \chi^2_{min}$ for the Run1 (left) and combination of Run1 and 2 (right) datasets. The lines correspond to different choices of fermion couplings $\kappa_F^{A,B}$ for $(\kappa_t, \kappa_b, \kappa_\tau)$. For example, AAA indicates $\kappa_t = \kappa_b = \kappa_\tau = \kappa_F^A$.

including several production mechanisms in the fit. For that reason, we use their two-dimensional fit to coupling modifiers, project on the 1σ range for κ_V and use it as an input for the fit.

The dependence of the χ^2 function with the scale of new physics f is shown in Fig. 2. The green and yellow bands correspond to the one- and two-sigma regions of the fit, and the left and right panels correspond to Run1 and the combination of Run1 and Run2, respectively. Different choices of fermion representations $\kappa_F^{A,B}$ (as explained in 1) lead to different χ^2 dependences.

The model-independent limit on f improves from 450 GeV (Run1) to 500 GeV (Run1+2) at 95% CL, where models with fermions in the A-type of coupling modifiers are less constrained. Moreover, one can see that the spread of limits on the scale f due to these fermion choices increases with the addition of more data, a signal that more data is increasingly more sensitive to these choices. To illustrate this point, assume that at some point in the future an excess in a channel is observed, whereas other channels remain consistent with the SM. For example, assume that the signal strength of the process $t\bar{t} \to H \to b\bar{b}$ was found to be twice the SM rate, whereas other processes involving the coupling of the Higgs to vector bosons and the well-understood channel $gg \to H \to \gamma\gamma$ remained consistent with the SM. In this case, certain representations for fermion embeddings of the top and bottom quarks would be preferred by data, see Fig. 3.

These limits on f should be compared with the limits of direct searches for new resonances. One would typically expect a set of new resonances, e.g. new massive W' and Z', to appear at some scale related to f, $m_{W'} = g_\rho f$, with $g_\rho \lesssim \mathcal{O}(4\pi)$. The value of g_ρ is an input to the effective theory, but can be obtained by performing a lattice simulation of the theory and investigating the spectrum of resonances. Its value depends on the specific



FIG. 3: $\chi(\xi)^2$ assuming a scenario where an excess is found in the channel $t\bar{t} \to H \to b\bar{b}$ whereas other channels remained consistent with the SM. The labels correspond to different hypothesis of $\kappa_F^{A,B}$ for (κ_t, κ_b). In this case, the choice $\kappa_t = \kappa_b = \kappa_F^B$ would be preferred by data. Here we assume a 30% uncertainties in these channels, except in $gg \to H \to \gamma\gamma$ where a 10% accuracy is assumed.

pattern of breaking as well as the possible electroweak effects. As an indicator of the value of g_ρ in these kind of models, we draw attention to the work done in the coset $SO(6)/SO(5)$ [40], where g_ρ was found to be $\mathcal{O}(10)$. In this case, a limit on $f \sim 500$ GeV, would correspond to a Z' and W' in the multi-TeV scale, certainly competitive with direct searches for these resonances.

Besides vector resonances, one would expect a tower of fermion resonances, or techni-baryons. Typically, these techni-baryons are heavier than the vector bound states by a factor of N_{TC}, with N_{TC} the number of colours in the new strongly coupled sector [41, 42]. Hence, naively one would expect fermion resonances again in the multi-TeV scale. Yet, in most Composite Higgs models the

mechanism of electroweak symmetry breaking depends on the existence of light techni-baryons (*top-partners*) with masses of the order of f, contrary to the large-N expectation. This mechanism is being tested by direct searches of heavy partners of the top, with recent Run2 results already sensitive to the 1.2 TeV region [43], clearly more competitive than the indirect searches in Higgs data if one believed this is the correct mechanism in place. Note, though, that the mass of the top partner is also linked to the amount of fine-tuning in these models. From this point of view the strong limits in top-partners may shed some doubts on the feasibility of this scenario, and maybe bring attention to other ideas of triggering electroweak symmetry breaking in Composite Higgs models which do not rely on light techni-baryons, for example by invoking the see-saw mechanism developed in Ref. [15]. See-saw Composite Higgs models can be directly tested by searching for new electroweak (non-coloured) scalars.

CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have summarised the structure of the Higgs couplings (parameterised by κ_V and κ_F) in Composite Higgs models. Although different CH models have very different predictions for the UV theory and the spectrum of higher mass resonances, we have identified generic forms for κ_V and κ_F which hold for many different choices of the coset group and fermion representations.

We have also looked into tree level effects on these couplings coming from extra states. In particular we studied the interesting possibility that an extra singlet pNGB may acquire a VEV. The modifications to κ_V and κ_F are to leading order just a sum of the corrections in elementary singlet + doublet models, and the usual correction expected in composite models. The same can be said for the case in which the Higgs mixes with an extra doublet.

We combined the Run 1 and recent Run 2 LHC data to set limits on CH models, finding that different choices for fermion representations lead to a spread of limits but a lower bound on the scale f can be set to 500 GeV. We also discussed how an excess in a Higgs channel such as $t\bar{t}H$, and $H \to b\bar{b}$ could pinpoint the type of CH model responsible for it.

[1] Georges Aad et al. Measurements of the Higgs boson production and decay rates and constraints on its couplings from a combined ATLAS and CMS analysis of the LHC pp collision data at $\sqrt{s} = 7$ and 8 TeV. *JHEP*, 08:045, 2016.

[2] Gabriele Ferretti and Denis Karateev. Fermionic UV completions of Composite Higgs models. *JHEP*, 03:077, 2014.

[3] Ben Gripaios, Alex Pomarol, Francesco Riva, and Javi Serra. Beyond the Minimal Composite Higgs Model. *JHEP*, 04:070, 2009.

[4] Gabriele Ferretti. UV Completions of Partial Compositeness: The Case for a SU(4) Gauge Group. *JHEP*, 06:142, 2014.

[5] Roberto Contino. The Higgs as a Composite Nambu-Goldstone Boson. In *Physics of the large and the small, TASI 09, proceedings of the Theoretical Advanced Study Institute in Elementary Particle Physics, Boulder, Colorado, USA, 1-26 June 2009*, pages 235–306, 2011.

[6] James Barnard, Tony Gherghetta, and Tirtha Sankar Ray. UV descriptions of composite Higgs models without elementary scalars. *JHEP*, 02:002, 2014.

[7] Roberto Contino and Alex Pomarol. The holographic composite Higgs. *Comptes Rendus Physique*, 8:1058–1067, 2007.

[8] Kaustubh Agashe, Roberto Contino, and Alex Pomarol. The Minimal composite Higgs model. *Nucl. Phys.*, B719:165–187, 2005.

[9] Marcela Carena, Leandro Da Rold, and Eduardo Pontón. Minimal Composite Higgs Models at the LHC. *JHEP*, 06:159, 2014.

[10] Adrian Carmona and Florian Goertz. A naturally light Higgs without light Top Partners. *JHEP*, 05:002, 2015.

[11] Roberto Contino. A Holographic composite Higgs model. In *Proceedings, 18th Conference on High Energy Physics (IFAE 2006): Pavia, Italy, April 19-21, 2006*, pages 215–218, 2007.

[12] Stefania De Curtis, Stefano Moretti, Kei Yagyu, and Emine Yildirim. Theory and Phenomenology of Composite 2-Higgs Doublet Models. 2016.

[13] J. Mrazek, A. Pomarol, R. Rattazzi, M. Redi, J. Serra, and A. Wulzer. The Other Natural Two Higgs Doublet Model. *Nucl. Phys.*, B853:1–48, 2011.

[14] Enrico Bertuzzo, Tirtha Sankar Ray, Hiroshi de Sandes, and Carlos A. Savoy. On Composite Two Higgs Doublet Models. *JHEP*, 05:153, 2013.

[15] Veronica Sanz and Jack Setford. Composite Higgses with seesaw EWSB. *JHEP*, 12:154, 2015.

[16] Aleksandr Azatov and Jamison Galloway. Light Custodians and Higgs Physics in Composite Models. *Phys. Rev.*, D85:055013, 2012.

[17] Csaba Csaki, Teng Ma, and Jing Shu. The Maximally Symmetric Composite Higgs. 2017.

[18] Matthew Low, Andrea Tesi, and Lian-Tao Wang. Twin Higgs mechanism and a composite Higgs boson. *Phys. Rev.*, D91:095012, 2015.

[19] Riccardo Barbieri, Davide Greco, Riccardo Rattazzi, and Andrea Wulzer. The Composite Twin Higgs scenario. *JHEP*, 08:161, 2015.

[20] R. Alonso, M. B. Gavela, L. Merlo, S. Rigolin, and J. Yepes. The Effective Chiral Lagrangian for a Light Dynamical "Higgs Particle". *Phys. Lett.*, B722:330–335, 2013. [Erratum: Phys. Lett.B726,926(2013)].

[21] Gerhard Buchalla, Oscar Catà, and Claudius Krause. Complete Electroweak Chiral Lagrangian with a Light Higgs at NLO. *Nucl. Phys.*, B880:552–573, 2014. [Erratum: Nucl. Phys.B913,475(2016)].

[22] I. Brivio, T. Corbett, O. J. P. Éboli, M. B. Gavela, J. Gonzalez-Fraile, M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, L. Merlo, and S. Rigolin. Disentangling a dynamical Higgs. *JHEP*, 03:024, 2014.

[23] I. Brivio, J. Gonzalez-Fraile, M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, and

L. Merlo. The complete HEFT Lagrangian after the LHC Run I. *Eur. Phys. J.*, C76(7):416, 2016.

[24] Curtis G. Callan, Sidney Coleman, J. Wess, and Bruno Zumino. Structure of phenomenological lagrangians. ii. *Phys. Rev.*, 177:2247–2250, Jan 1969.

[25] P. Sikivie, Leonard Susskind, Mikhail B. Voloshin, and Valentin I. Zakharov. Isospin Breaking in Technicolor Models. *Nucl. Phys.*, B173:189–207, 1980.

[26] Roberto Contino, Thomas Kramer, Minho Son, and Raman Sundrum. Warped/composite phenomenology simplified. *JHEP*, 05:074, 2007.

[27] Kaustubh Agashe, Roberto Contino, Leandro Da Rold, and Alex Pomarol. A Custodial symmetry for $Zb\bar{b}$. *Phys. Lett.*, B641:62–66, 2006.

[28] Brando Bellazzini, Csaba Csáki, and Javi Serra. Composite Higgses. *Eur. Phys. J.*, C74(5):2766, 2014.

[29] Martin Gorbahn, Jose Miguel No, and Veronica Sanz. Benchmarks for Higgs Effective Theory: Extended Higgs Sectors. *JHEP*, 10:036, 2015.

[30] Djuna Croon, Veronica Sanz, and Jack Setford. Goldstone Inflation. *JHEP*, 10:020, 2015.

[31] Djuna Croon, Veronica Sanz, and Ewan R. M. Tarrant. Reheating with a composite Higgs boson. *Phys. Rev.*, D94(4):045010, 2016.

[32] Jose R. Espinosa, Ben Gripaios, Thomas Konstandin, and Francesco Riva. Electroweak Baryogenesis in Non-minimal Composite Higgs Models. *JCAP*, 1201:012, 2012.

[33] G. C. Branco, P. M. Ferreira, L. Lavoura, M. N. Rebelo, Marc Sher, and Joao P. Silva. Theory and phenomenology of two-Higgs-doublet models. *Phys. Rept.*, 516:1–102, 2012.

[34] Measurement of fiducial, differential and production cross sections in the $H \to \gamma\gamma$ decay channel with 13.3 fb^{-1} of 13 TeV proton-proton collision data with the ATLAS detector. Technical Report ATLAS-CONF-2016-067, CERN, Geneva, Aug 2016.

[35] Study of the Higgs boson properties and search for high-mass scalar resonances in the $H \to ZZ^* \to 4\ell$ decay channel at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector. Technical Report ATLAS-CONF-2016-079, CERN, Geneva, Aug 2016.

[36] Measurements of the Higgs boson production cross section via Vector Boson Fusion and associated WH production in the $WW^* \to \ell\nu\ell\nu$ decay mode with the ATLAS detector at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. Technical Report ATLAS-CONF-2016-112, CERN, Geneva, Nov 2016.

[37] Search for the Standard Model Higgs boson produced in association with a vector boson and decaying to a $b\bar{b}$ pair in pp collisions at 13 TeV using the ATLAS detector. Technical Report ATLAS-CONF-2016-091, CERN, Geneva, Aug 2016.

[38] Measurements of properties of the Higgs boson decaying into four leptons in pp collisions at sqrts = 13 TeV. Technical Report CMS-PAS-HIG-16-041, CERN, Geneva, 2017.

[39] Search for the associated production of a Higgs boson with a top quark pair in final states with a τ lepton at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV. Technical Report CMS-PAS-HIG-17-003, CERN, Geneva, 2017.

[40] Randy Lewis, Claudio Pica, and Francesco Sannino. Light Asymmetric Dark Matter on the Lattice: SU(2) Technicolor with Two Fundamental Flavors. *Phys. Rev.*, D85:014504, 2012.

[41] Gerard 't Hooft. A Planar Diagram Theory for Strong Interactions. *Nucl. Phys.*, B72:461, 1974.

[42] Edward Witten. Baryons in the 1/n Expansion. *Nucl. Phys.*, B160:57–115, 1979.

[43] Search for pair production of vector-like top quarks in events with one lepton and an invisibly decaying Z boson. Technical Report ATLAS-CONF-2017-015, CERN, Geneva, Aug 2016.